

DEC 08 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:)	
BRIEF ET AL.)	
)	
Serial No. 10/816,323)	Atty. Docket No.:
)	51400 (GCSD1550)
Filing Date: APRIL 1, 2004)	
)	Art Unit:
Confirmation No. 9133)	2874
)	
For: RUGGEDIZED MODULE FOR SECURELY)	Examiner:
RETAINING MULTI-OPTICAL FIBER)	JULIANA KANG
INTERCONNECT FERRULES)	
)	

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR RESTRICTION

VIA FACSIMILE NO. 571-273-8300
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated November 22 2005, the following remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the above-identified application. The requirement for restriction, as set forth on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, is respectfully traversed.

It is Applicants' understanding that a requirement for restriction must be based upon distinctions or differences in the definitions of the inventions that are restricted from one another, in particular, the manner in which the inventions are defined in the claims.

In support of the demarcation between the invention defined in Claims 1-6 and 8-14 and the invention defined in Claim 7, the explanation in paragraph 2, of page 2, of the outstanding